

## Interview Summary

Application No.

09/686,346

Applicant(s)

Cobb et al.

Examiner

Maryam Monshipouri

Art Unit

1652



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Maryam Monshipouri

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Mr. M.B. Wilson

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview May 16, 2003

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic      b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes      e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Claim(s) discussed: 28, 29, and 34

Identification of prior art discussed:

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

It was indicated that although no prior art anticipated the elected invention (methods of use of TAO2 kinases only), the claims are subject to 112 first rejections as variants recited in claims 28 and 29 are too broad. Also it was mentioned that the invention is merely enabled when MEK3 or MEK6 could be used in step (c) of claims 28-29 because the inventor herself has published that TAO polypeptides do not bind MEK2, 5 or 4. The examiner suggested to use the variant language used in the parent case (U.S. Pat No. 6, 165,461) claims and restrict the claims to TAO2 polypeptides in order to put the claims possibly in condition for allowance.

In response, Mr. Wilson agreed with the examiner's proposal and after talking to the applicant gave the authority to the examiner to amend the claims accordingly, in an examiner's amendment.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required